

REMARKS

Claims 4-8 are pending in the application, and are rejected. Claims 4-8 are objected to.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-8 are objected to because in claim 4, line 2, “slot having such a mode that the” should be --slots each having a--; line 3, “right” should be deleted; line 4, “to define the right sectional shape of an opening” should be deleted; line 8, “in” should be --of—(similar in claim 5); line 9, “the” should be --an--; penultimate line “opening portion” should be deleted; last line, “supports an” should be --supports the--. Applicants herein amend the claims.

The Examiner asserts that claim 4 is confusing because both the engaging projection and the opening wall are recited as engaging and supporting an engaging portion of an engaging lever of an inserted plug.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Applicants note that it is entirely possible that both the engaging projection and the opening wall engage and support an engaging portion of an engaging lever of an inserted plug. It is only the engaging projection that latches the engaging portion of the engaging lever of the plug to be inserted. It is not a contradiction to claim that both the engaging projection and the opening wall of the front loading slot both engage and support the plug.

With respect to claim 6, Applicants note that there does not appear to be antecedent basis for “said respective plug loading slots” because claim 4 can be read to include an embodiment having a single plug loading slot. Applicants further note that the language “for right and left

channels” and “disposed such that both the plug loading slots are in symmetrical disposition” is confusing, and therefore is presently clarified.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamarauskas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,929) in view of Slack et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,736,680) and Wu (U.S. Patent No. 6,447,340).

The Examiner asserts that Applicants’ prior arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, because Slack et al. shows an opening wall of the plug loading slot as having engaging projections.

Applicants disagree with the rejection because not all of the claimed limitations are taught or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Applicants note that Slack discloses an opening 24 that has a cross section similar to that of “a plug loading slot formed projected for engagement” of the present invention. However, the opening 24 of slack patent is fully stepped and has no function of engagement. Therefore, the opening 24 of Slack patent is different from a “wall” projection 21b for engaging a plug of the present invention, and does not meet the present limitation.

Applicants note that the phrase “a difference in distances of terminals” according to claim 5 of the present application is characterized by prevention of noise occurring, prevention of a UL-listed test finger from being in contact and the following feature:

Speaker terminals used in the present invention are a pair of the same terminals. With this configuration, it is possible to realize a difference in distances of the terminals from the opening face and to realize a difference in distances of the terminals out to board side (lengthwise distances) as noted in Fig. 6. This difference in distances brings about the following merit:

Formed on the print board is an electric circuit made of beaten-copper. This beaten-copper circuit has a necessary area reserved based on acceptable current around openings into which the ends of the above-mentioned terminals are inserted. That is, the beaten-copper circuit between the openings into which the terminals are inserted has to constitute a required insulation distance. Therefore, the longer the distance between the pair of terminals out to the board side, the more advantageously the insulation distance is realized.

Because the present invention utilizes a pair of terminals of same shape, if the terminals are disposed with a difference in their distances from the opening face of the loading slot, there can consequently produce an effect of providing a difference in distance of the pair terminals out to the print board side.

Wu does not suggest such a point of the terminals at all. According to Wu, one of the terminals is bent (see Figs. 1 and 3 of Wu Patent) to provide a difference in their distances.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.


Application No. 10/776,258
Attorney Docket No. 021091A

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.116
Response filed: August 4, 2005

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP


Kenneth H. Salen
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,077
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

KHS/cas